



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,183	03/29/2001	Srinivas Gutta	US010105	4515

24737 7590 03/09/2007  
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS  
P.O. BOX 3001  
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

SHEPARD, JUSTIN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/09/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/821,183	GUTTA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Justin E. Shepard	2623	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9,11-19,21 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9,11-19,21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 1/18/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Page 12, portion starting with "Clearly, the cited":

The applicant argues that the limitation of the "action preferences of a user," is not met by Imagawa. The applicant gives examples in a previous paragraph such as "the user may specify that he or she likes to pause the media player when the telephone rings unless the call is from a particular number." While this limitation is not found in Imagawa, the interpretation of "action preference of a user," is found in Imagawa. The action preference is being interpreted as the allowance of television watching depending on the identity of the person watching the television. The rejection stands.

What follows are the rejections from the previous Office Action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 15, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imagawa in view of Herrington.

Referring to claim 1, Imagawa discloses a method for controlling a media player, comprising:

establishing at least one rule defining a predefined user activity (column 3, lines 53-57; column 10, lines 40-45), said rule including at least one condition (column 10, lines 40-45), and an action item to be performed to automatically adjust said media player in accordance with action preferences of said user when said condition is satisfied (column 10, lines 40-45);

analyzing at least one of audio and video information focused on said user to identify said condition (column 2, lines 31-42); and

performing said action item if said condition is satisfied (column 10, lines 40-45).

Imagawa does not disclose a method for controlling a media player that includes information external to user, wherein the additional information external to said user includes a feature of media on said media player.

Herrington discloses a method for controlling a media player that includes information external to user, wherein the additional information external to said user includes a feature of media on said media player (figure 4B).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the rating restriction from Herrington to the system disclosed by Imagawa. The motivation would have been that the system allows individuals to be identified (Imagawa: column 10, lines 40-45) and programming restrictions for specific users.

Claims 11 and 21 are rejected on the same grounds as claim 1.

Referring to claim 6, Imagawa discloses a method for controlling a device, comprising:

analyzing at least one of audio and video information focused on a user to identify at least one predefined user activity (column 2, lines 31-42; column 3, lines 53-57);

performing a predefined action item to automatically adjust said device in accordance with action preferences of said user based on said additional information when said user activity is identified, wherein the predefined user activity is not related to controlling the device (column 10, lines 40-45).

Imagawa does not disclose a method for analyzing additional information external to a external user, wherein the additional information external to said user includes a feature of media on said device.

Herrington discloses a method for analyzing additional information external to a external user, wherein the additional information external to said user includes a feature of media on said device (figure 4B).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the rating restriction from Herrington to the system disclosed by Imagawa. The motivation would have been that the system allows individuals to be identified (Imagawa: column 10, lines 40-45) and programming restrictions for specific users.

Claims 16 and 22 are rejected on the same grounds as claim 6.

As for Claim 5 Imagawa et al. teach said user activity is a predefined gesture command and said action item is the issuance of a corresponding command to said media player (see col. 11 lines 52-58 "When a person makes a motion of applying forefinger to the front of the mouth or plugging the ears with the hands, the control object candidate determination section 3 determines as a candidate the television that outputs sound, and the control content candidate determination section 4 determines the reduction of the sound volume as a candidate for the content of control.>").

Claim 15 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 5.

Claims 2, 7, 12, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imagawa in view of Herrington as applied to claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 15, 16, 21, and 22 above, and further in view of DeVito.

As for Claims 2, 7, 12, 17, and 18 the claims differ in that Imagawa and Herrington do not expressly teach said user activity suggests that said user is not paying attention to said media player and said action item is the issuance of a command to pause said media player. However, in the same field of endeavor, DeVito teaches a method and apparatus for measuring and analyzing the psychological states of a subject and using the gather information to control devices, such as media players. See DeVito (0003) "the present invention relates to the measurement and real-time analysis of bioelectrical signals for interaction with electronic media, such as motion pictures, digital video, video games," and (0010) "A presence detecting function which senses the relationship of a subject to a predetermined space may be used to select an object

or appliance to be controlled within a space. The control signals may be used to affect objects e.g., a compact disk player," and also (0112) "Additionally, a delay may be specified which causes the movie to pause for the specified duration before proceeding to the next scene or set. Such a delay may be used, for example, to wait for a change in the subject's emotional state, which change then directs the branching of the movie to the next scene." And also see (0116) "The script may also specify that playback should halt until a specified criteria is satisfied. One example is a rapid eye movement ("REM") trigger, which is particularly useful for use with interactive dream movies or for triggering dream stimulus . . . Another example may be to wait for the beta band power and the median beta frequency to exceed thresholds indicating the viewer is paying attention." Clearly, DeVito teaches analyzing the emotional state of a subject that comprises pausing or halting playback of a media player when the emotional state of the user indicates that the user is not paying attention to the media player. In light of the teaching of DeVito, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Imagawa and Herrington to have the media player be paused in response to an indication that the user is not paying attention to the media player. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do this in order to not have a user missing a programming that is displayed on a media player, when it is determined that the user is not paying attention to the media player.

Claims 3, 8, 13, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imagawa in view of Herrington in view of DeVito as applied to claims 2, 7, 12, and 17 above, and further in view of Pijnenburg.

As for Claim 3, 8, 13, and 18, the claims differ in that neither Imagawa, Herrington, nor DeVito expressly teach said user activity suggests that said user is not paying attention to said media player and said action item is the issuance of a command to said media player to begin recording.

Pijnenburg discloses a television viewing system where recording starts when the player is paused (column 3, lines 57-59).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the ability to record when the system pauses, as taught by Pijnenburg, to the system that pauses when a level of interest is not detected as disclosed by Imagawa, Herrington and DeVito. The motivation would have been to allow the viewer to leave unexpectedly, and not miss anything shown in the television program (Pijnenburg: column 3, line 58).

Claims 4, 9, 14, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imagawa in view of Herrington as applied to claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 15, 16, 21, and 22 above, and further in view of Kimoto.

As for Claims 4, 9, 14, and 19 the claims differ in that Imagawa and Herrington do not expressly teach said user activity suggests that said user is not paying attention to said media player and said action item is the issuance of a command to said media



Art Unit: 2623

player to enter a power save mode. However, Kimoto et al. teaches a method and apparatus for power saving modes for a media player (such a computer monitor) when the media player has been on, but not in use for a specified amount of time (see Kimoto et al. col. 1 lines 8-12 "In order to reduce power consumption, computer monitors have been designed having a power- save mode that is automatically selected after the monitor has been on, but not in use, for a long period of time." When the monitor has been on, but not in use, for a long period of time, this condition is interpreted as the user has not been paying attention to said media player for specified amount of time.) in light of the teaching of Kimoto et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Imagawa and Herrington to issue a command to said media player to enter a power save mode when the user activity suggests that said user is not paying attention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to conserve energy consumed by the media player when the user is not paying attention to the media player. (see Kimoto et al. col. 1 lines 8-12 "In order to reduce power consumption, computer monitors have been designed having a power-save mode that is automatically selected after the monitor has been on, but not in use, for a long period of time." ).

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin E. Shepard whose telephone number is (571) 272-5967. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JS

  
SCOTT E. BELIVEAU  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER